

CHECKLIST ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT	
Project Name: Former homesite Lease 9378 clean-up.	Proposed Implementation Date: Spring 2019
Proponent: Tim Fouhy, 258 Butte Creek Rd., Peerless, MT 59253	
Type and Purpose of Action: The applicant has applied for a Land Use License (LUL) to demolish/remove buildings, debris and foundations from former homesite lease No. 9378, in order to reclassify the land for agricultural use. The proponent would clear the site by removal of the buildings/debris from the site, or by burying and/or burning the buildings and debris on-site.	
Location: SE4SW4 Section 17, Township 36N, Range 45E	County: Daniels

I. PROJECT DEVELOPMENT	
1. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT, AGENCIES, GROUPS OR INDIVIDUALS CONTACTED: Provide a brief chronology of the scoping and ongoing involvement for this project.	Mr. Fouhy held homesite lease 9378 until 2/28/2019, when the lease expired and was not renewed for another term. Prior to this, Glasgow Unit staff discussed options for the lease with Mr. Fouhy, as he had indicated he did not wish to renew the lease. The buildings on this lease are unused and in disrepair. It was decided that a LUL could be issued to Mr. Fouhy to allow him to clean up the property while he did not hold a homesite lease.
2. OTHER GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES WITH JURISDICTION, LIST OF PERMITS NEEDED:	The Montana Department of Natural Resources and Conservation (DNRC) has sole jurisdiction over the land surface within the area of impact. The proponent applied for a LUL and this will have to be approved and issued by DNRC staff in the Glasgow Unit office prior to starting the project.
3. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED:	Action Alternative: Grant a LUL to the proponent to clean up the site. No Action Alternative: Deny a LUL to the proponent to clean up the site.

II. IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

RESOURCE	POTENTIAL IMPACTS
4. GEOLOGY AND SOIL QUALITY, STABILITY AND MOISTURE: Are fragile, compatible or unstable soils present? Are there unusual geologic features? Are there special reclamation considerations?	<p>The area of impact consists of Farland-Cherry silt loams with 2 to 8% slopes. This soil is not fragile or unstable. No unusual geographic features are present and no special reclamation considerations are necessary.</p> <p>Action Alternative: Removal of material from the site would require the use of heavy equipment such as tractors and would result in slight soil disturbance. If any material is buried, this would result in a greater level of soil disturbance and leave small areas of bare soil. Burning of buildings and debris would likely result in temporary bare patches of soil. These impacts would be expected to be quickly mitigated with natural regrowth of vegetation.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: Under this alternative there will be no changes to soils on the School Trust land.</p>
5. WATER QUALITY, QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION: Are important surface or groundwater resources present? Is there potential for violation of ambient water quality standards, drinking water maximum contaminant levels, or degradation of water quality?	<p>There are no important water resources present within the area of impact. The only water resource in the immediate area is an old well adjacent to the house on the homesite, which does not produce water anymore, according to the proponent.</p> <p>Action Alternative: A requirement of the LUL would be that the proponent cap the well and bury it. This will not change the availability of water in the area, as the well does not produce anyways.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: Under this alternative, there will be no impacts to water quality, quantity and distribution.</p>

II. IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

6. AIR QUALITY: Will pollutants or particulate be produced? Is the project influenced by air quality regulations or zones (Class I airshed)?

This project is not influenced by any air quality regulations or zones.

Action Alternative: If any building/debris is burned on the site, hazardous smoke will be produced. The proponent would be required to get the proper permits from the appropriate agencies prior to any burning, thereby abiding by any local air quality regulations that may be in place at the time.

No Action Alternative: Under this alternative there will be no impacts to air quality.

7. VEGETATION COVER, QUANTITY AND QUALITY: Will vegetative communities be permanently altered? Are any rare plants or cover types present?

The current vegetative community in the immediate vicinity of the buildings consists primarily of non-native grasses, shrubs and forbs. There are no rare plant species present.

Action Alternative: Small patches of vegetation will likely be destroyed if any buildings are buried. Burning may result in some destruction of vegetation, depending on the timing of the burn. These impacts would be temporary, as regrowth of the impacted areas would be expected within a year.

No Action Alternative: Under this alternative there will be no impacts to the plant communities on the School Trust land.

8. TERRESTRIAL, AVIAN AND AQUATIC LIFE AND HABITATS: Is there substantial use of the area by important wildlife, birds or fish?

There are several rows of trees that form a shelter belt near the buildings that provide good winter habitat for upland birds and deer.

Action Alternative: The removal of buildings and debris from the site would likely result in increased use of the area by wildlife.

No Action Alternative: Under this alternative there will be no impacts

II. IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT	
	to the possible use of the School Trust land as wildlife habitat.
<p>9. UNIQUE, ENDANGERED, FRAGILE OR LIMITED ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES: Are any federally listed threatened or endangered species or identified habitat present? Any wetlands? Sensitive Species or Species of special concern?</p>	<p>The area of impact does not contain fragile or critical habitat. No wetlands present. There is one species of concern listed as being present within the area of impact: Ferruginous Hawk.</p> <p>Action Alternative: The removal of buildings and debris from the site would likely result in increased use of the area by wildlife.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: Under this alternative there will be no impacts to the environmental resources.</p>
<p>10. HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES: Are any historical, archaeological or paleontological resources present?</p>	<p>The area of impact contains no historical, archaeological or paleontological resources.</p> <p>Action Alternative: The project will have no impact on historical, archaeological or paleontological resources.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: There will be no impact to historical or archaeological sites under this alternative.</p>
<p>11. AESTHETICS: Is the project on a prominent topographic feature? Will it be visible from populated or scenic areas? Will there be excessive noise or light?</p>	<p>The area of impact is directly adjacent to a county road and is readily visible to the public.</p> <p>Action Alternative: There would no longer be unsightly buildings directly adjacent to the county road, and instead a pasture/field similar to the majority of the surrounding area.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: Under this alternative the buildings will continue to deteriorate and look worse and worse over time.</p>
<p>12. DEMANDS ON ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES OF LAND, WATER, AIR OR ENERGY: Will the project use resources that</p>	<p>Environmental resources in the area are not specifically limited and are not affected by the proposed project.</p>

II. IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT	
are limited in the area? Are there other activities nearby that will affect the project?	<p>No nearby activities will affect the project.</p> <p>Action Alternative: The proposed project will place no demands on any environmental resources in the area.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: Under this alternative there will be no demands placed on environmental resources of land, water, air or energy.</p>
13. OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS PERTINENT TO THE AREA: Are there other studies, plans or projects on this tract?	<p>There are currently no other studies, plans or projects on this tract of School Trust land.</p> <p>Action Alternative: This project will not impact any other plans or studies that DNRC has on this School Trust land.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: Under this alternative there will be no impacts to the plans or studies that DNRC has on this School Trust land.</p>

III. IMPACTS ON THE HUMAN POPULATION	
RESOURCE	POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES
14. HUMAN HEALTH AND SAFETY: Will this project add to health and safety risks in the area?	<p>The operation and movement of heavy equipment and vehicles has inherent risks whether on School Trust land or not. Burning of buildings can be dangerous and has the potential to cause a larger fire.</p> <p>Action Alternative: Clean-up of the site would require the use of heavy equipment such as a tractor. Proponent would be required to get the proper permits from the appropriate agencies prior to any burning, with the aim of reducing the risk associated with burning the buildings.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: Under this</p>

	alternative there will be no impacts to human health or safety.
15. INDUSTRIAL, COMMERCIAL AND AGRICULTURAL ACTIVITIES AND PRODUCTION: Will the project add to or alter these activities?	<p>The area of impact is currently classified as a homesite but could be used for an agriculture/grazing lease with the removal of the buildings.</p> <p>Action Alternative: The removal of the buildings will allow for grazing of the area by livestock or harvesting of hay, providing revenue on the site.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: Under this alternative there will be no impacts to agricultural activities on the School Trust land.</p>
16. QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYMENT: Will the project create, move or eliminate jobs? If so, estimated number.	<p>Action Alternative: The project will not create nor impact any jobs in the area.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: There will be no impacts to quantity and distribution of employment under this alternative.</p>
17. LOCAL AND STATE TAX BASE AND TAX REVENUES: Will the project create or eliminate tax revenue?	<p>Action Alternative: The project will have no impacts on the local and state tax base and tax revenues.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: There will be no impacts to the local and state tax base under this alternative.</p>
18. DEMAND FOR GOVERNMENT SERVICES: Will substantial traffic be added to existing roads? Will other services (fire protection, police, schools, etc) be needed?	<p>Action Alternative: There would be no additional demand for governmental services.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: Under this alternative there will be no additional demand for government services.</p>
19. LOCALLY ADOPTED ENVIRONMENTAL PLANS AND GOALS: Are there State, County, City, USFS, BLM, Tribal, etc. zoning or management plans in effect?	<p>There are no special management plans in effect on the School Trust land. It is currently managed as a homesite.</p> <p>Action Alternative: The project has approval from the Glasgow Unit staff, but a LUL would need to be issued for work to commence.</p>

	<p>No Action Alternative: Under this type of alternative there will be no impacts on locally adopted environmental plans and goals.</p>
<p>20. ACCESS TO AND QUALITY OF RECREATIONAL AND WILDERNESS ACTIVITIES: Are wilderness or recreational areas nearby or accessed through this tract? Is there recreational potential within the tract?</p>	<p>This tract has fair potential for recreation. No wilderness areas or additional public lands are accessed through this tract.</p> <p>Action Alternative: No changes to public land access or recreational potential are expected.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: There will be no impacts to the recreational values associated with the School Trust land under this alternative.</p>
<p>21. DENSITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION AND HOUSING: Will the project add to the population and require additional housing?</p>	<p>Action Alternative: The project will not impact the density and distribution of population and housing.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: There will be no impacts to the density and distribution of population and housing.</p>
<p>22. SOCIAL STRUCTURES AND MORES: Is some disruption of native or traditional lifestyles or communities possible?</p>	<p>Action Alternative: The project will not disrupt the traditional lifestyles of the local community.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: There will be no impacts to the social structures under this alternative.</p>
<p>23. CULTURAL UNIQUENESS AND DIVERSITY: Will the action cause a shift in some unique quality of the area?</p>	<p>Action Alternative: The project will not impact the cultural uniqueness and diversity of this rural area.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: There will be no impacts to the cultural uniqueness and diversity under this alternative.</p>
<p>24. OTHER APPROPRIATE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CIRCUMSTANCES:</p>	<p>Currently, this homesite is unleased and is producing no revenue for the School Trust. Mr. Fouhy did not renew his lease since the fee was set to increase significantly in the new term, and he gets no use from the buildings on the homesite.</p>

Action Alternative: Removal of the buildings would allow for the acreage to be leased as a grazing or agriculture lease, thereby providing revenue to the trust.

No Action Alternative: There will be no impacts to the social and economic circumstances under this alternative.

EA Checklist Prepared By: s/Jack Medlicott Date: 3/27/19
Jack Medlicott Land Use Specialist

IV. FINDING

25. ALTERNATIVE SELECTED:

Action Alternative

26. SIGNIFICANCE OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS:

No significant Impacts expected.

27. Need for Further Environmental Analysis:

☐ EIS

☐ More Detailed EA

☒ No Further Analysis

EA Checklist Approved By: Matthew Poole Glasgow Unit Manager
Name Title

s/Matthew Poole\s Date: March 27, 2019
Signature